

REMARKS

Claims 9-13, as amended, remain herein.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite an optical disc control method including inputting a signal indicating an amount of deviation of a converging unit from a center of a light receiving element in an optical head, moving the converging unit according to the signal while the optical head is stopping, and changing a value of the signal to an approximately zero value, and starting a traverse control of the objective head using the signal after completion of the moving. The terms "objective lens" and "converging unit" are the same thing, and therefore such terms have been unified for clarity. The objective lens is located in the optical head. See applicants' Fig. 1 and the specification, page 17, second full paragraph. Claim 11 has been amended to recite corresponding apparatus for performing a method like that of claim 9. Minor, editorial changes have been made in claims 10 and 12.

Serial No.: 10/799,644

1. The title has been amended to read "Optical Disc Apparatus Having Compensation For Objective Lens Dislocation, and Method Therefor."

2. Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Tani U.S. Patent 5,808,975.

The presently claimed optical disc control method includes inputting a signal indicating an amount of deviation of a converging unit from a center of a light receiving element in an optical head, moving the converging unit according to the signal while the optical head is stopping, and changing a value of the signal to an approximately zero value, and starting a traverse control of the objective head using the signal after completion of the moving. This method and corresponding apparatus for performing such method are nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Tani '975, column 8, lines 25-54 as allegedly disclosing objective lens 186, spot position detecting circuit 66 to determine an amount of deviation E2 of objective lens 186 from a center of light receiving element 47, and a

Serial No.: 10/799,644

controller for instructing movement of the objective lens. But in fact, Tani '975, Fig. 10A, discloses the tracking actuator for performing a lens lock using a spot position servo during accessing. This has the effect of controlling lens vibration during accessing. When speed control (coarse control) of a traverse motor (VCM) is performed, the present speed is detected by counting the signal, which is outputted from a track zero-cross point circuit 92, thereby causing an error due to lens vibration. To prevent such errors, the Tani '975 tracking actuator executes a lens lock, as shown in Tani '975, 10A.

In contrast, the presently claimed optical disc control method controls movement of the converging unit according to a deviation signal, while the optical head is stopping. When that happens, even when momentum causes dislocation of the optical head, the presently claimed invention stably executes traverse servo control of the optical head using the spot deviation signal, i.e., the signal indicating an amount of deviation of the converging unit from a center of a light receiving element in the optical head. Thus, the presently claimed invention (1) inputs a signal indicating an amount of deviation of the

Serial No.: 10/799,644

converging unit from a center of a light receiving element in the optical head, (2) moves the converging unit according to the signal while the optical head is stopping, (3) changes a value of the signal to an approximately zero value, and (4) starts traverse control of the optical head using the signal after completion of the moving operation. Tani '975 does not disclose or suggest these four steps, or apparatus for performing those four steps. Instead, Tnai '975 discloses an entirely different approach.

For the foregoing reasons, Tani '975 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Tani '975 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 10, which depends from claim 9, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 9, and claim 12 which depends from claim 11, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 11. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/799,644

All claims 9-13 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 9-13 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

December 7, 2004

Date



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: HYAE:095A

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220